REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43 and 42-52 stand rejected.

No claims are cancelled.

No claims are added.

Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43 and 42-52 remain in this application.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-32, 42-43, 45-52 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,694,485 B1 to Kelly et al (Kelly) in view of U.S. Patent 5,634,064 to Warnock et al (Warnock). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Kelly teaches viewing hypertext markup language (html) files. A method is taught were a computer and display screen are provided, where the display screen has an adjustable number of screen rows for displaying lines of text on the display screen. An html file containing lines of text is accessed. The total number of lines of text in the html file is determined. A portion of the total number of lines of text in the html file is viewed such that the portion has lines of text assigned to screen rows of the display screen such that only entire lines of text are displayed on the display screen. (See Kelly, col. 2 lines 17-27)

Kelly further teaches creating and using a reserve table. In particular, the reserve table may be created after the html file is accessed. The reserve table contains the number of screen rows and the total number of lines of text in the html file. Lines of text in the html file are assigned to the screen rows. The number of lines of text in the html file is written to correspond to the screen rows. After viewing the portion, the reserve table may be read to determine which of the

lines of text in the html file corresponding to the screen rows is (are) to be viewed on the display screen and writing the lines of text determined from the reserve table to the screen rows for viewing. (See Kelly, col. 2 lines 28-38)

The html file has a fixed number of text lines. "Absolute row numbers" represent the text line numbers of each row of the html file. The absolute row numbers start at number 1 and proceed in sequence to the end of the html file. (Kelly col. 6, lines 32-37). As an example, when an html file contains 38 lines of text, the reserve table would contain 38 absolute row numbers representing each line of the html file. Thus, absolute row numbers 1 to 38 are written onto the reserve table 500, where absolute row numbers correspond to screen row numbers. (See Kelly col. 7, lines 13-17 and Fig. 6).

Independent claim 1 recites in part "paginating one or more pages of the fixed digital document into multiple virtual pages".

The Action presents that this element is taught in Kelly Fig. 5, element 102, and col. 7, lines 13-23. Element 102 of Fig. 5 of Kelly teaches that screen rows are computed according to font type and size of the text (See Kelly col. 7, lines 8-10). The Action's cited section of Kelly teaches the reserve table that contains corresponding absolute row numbers and lines (text) of an html file.

As discussed above, Kelly teaches corresponding absolute row numbers of the html file to screen row numbers of the display screen. Each absolute row number is a line of text, not a virtual page. Kelly does not teach or suggest "one or more pages" and "multiple virtual pages". Kelly teaches particular lines of text that correspond with screen row numbers.

Claim 1 further recites "identifying and locating lines of text within the one or more pages of the fixed document".

The Action presents that this element is taught in Kelly Fig. 6, and col. 7, lines 13-23. Fig. 6 of Kelly is the reserve table that relates absolute row numbers to screen row numbers. The cited section of Kelly teaches the reserve table.

Kelly is directed to identifying particular lines of text and corresponding the lines of text to screen rows, and does not teach that such lines of text are particular to a page. Kelly does not teach that lines of text are associated with pages of a document. The reserve table of Kelly associates lines of text (absolute row numbers) with screen rows of a display screen. Therefore, Kelly does not teach the element of "identifying and locating lines of text within the one or more pages of the fixed document".

Claim 1 further recites "determining whether a virtual-page boundary is coextensive with an identified line of text".

The Action presents that this element is taught in Kelly Fig. 6, and col. 7, lines 13-32). As discussed above, Fig. 6 is the reserve table that relates absolute row numbers (text lines) with screen rows. The cited section of Kelly teaches that when the reserve table is accessed by a web browser, lines of text are read from the html file to determine the screen row that corresponds to the particular line of text and which screen row number will appear on the display screen. Data from the reserve table is written to the screen so that the lines of text corresponding to the absolute row numbers are written to the screen at the designated screen rows indicated by the reserve table. (See Kelly, col. 7 lines 23-32).

There is nothing in this cited section or anywhere in Kelly that teaches a "virtual page" or "virtual page boundary". Therefore, there is no teaching as to "determining whether a virtual-page boundary is coextensive with an identified

line of text". As discussed, text lines are particularly identified in the reserve table, and correspond with screen rows of the display screen.

Claim 1 further recites "responsive to such determining, adjusting the virtual-page boundary if the boundary is coextensive with the identified line of text so that the boundary is not coextensive with the identified line".

The Action presents that this element is taught in Kelly col. 7, lines 63-77, col. 7, lines 1-4. This specific section teaches that a web browser checks location of the text to be displayed on the display screen before presenting the text to a user. If a condition occurs that displays a partial line of the text on the top or bottom of the web browser screen, the text is repositioned.

Kelly teaches that the text is repositioned, and does not teach adjusting a boundary as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, as discussed above, Kelly fails to teach or suggest a virtual page or virtual page boundary.

Warnock is cited for teaching a digital document. In particular, Warnock teaches creating a source document and converting it to a PDF document (See Warnock, Fig. 3B, col. 5 lines 46-53). Warnock, however, provides no assistance in light of Kelly as to the recited methodology of claim 1. Accordingly, a combination of Kelly and Warnock fails to teach or suggest every element of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 is therefore improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 1 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend from and comprise all the elements of claim 1. As such, dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 2-4 and 6-8 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 9 is rejected based on similar reasons as claim 1. Applicants assert the arguments presented in support of claim 1, in support of claim 9. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 11-18 depend from and comprise all the elements of claim 9. As such, dependent claims 11-18 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 9. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 11-18 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 19 is rejected based on similar reasons as claims 1 and 2. Applicants assert the arguments presented in support of claim 1 (claim 2 depending on claim 1), in support of claim 19. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 21-25 depend from and comprise all the elements of claim 19. As such, dependent claims 21-25 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 19. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 21-25 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 26 recites in part "paginating one or more pages of a digital document into multiple virtual pages". As discussed above in support of claim 1, Kelly fails tot teach or suggest this element.

Claim 26 further recites "displaying the virtual pages of the multiple virtual pages, wherein unrepeated content of multiple virtual page starts at a common spatial position on the multiple virtual page".

The Action presents that this element is taught in Kelly Fig. 6, and col. 7, lines 18-23. As discussed Fig. 6 of Kelly is the reserve table that relates absolute row numbers to screen row numbers. There is nothing in this cited section or in

Kelly as to "a common spatial position" directed to "virtual pages" as recited in this element of claim 26.

Warnock is cited for teaching a "lowlighting or using half-tone to visually identify context within a document". Warnock, however, provides no assistance in light of Kelly as to the recited methodology of claim 26. Accordingly, a combination of Kelly and Warnock fails to teach or suggest every element of claim 26, and the rejection of claim 26 is therefore improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 29-32 depend from and comprise all the elements of claim 26. As such, dependent claims 29-32 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 26. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 29-32 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 42 recites in part "paginating, accordingly, one or more pages of the digital document into multiple virtual pages". As discussed above in support of claim 1, Kelly fails tot teach or suggest this element.

Claim 42 further recites "determining an integer number of virtual pages per page of a digital document while maintaining legibility, aspect ratio, and good margins, wherein the digital document is a fixed digital document".

The Action presents that this element is taught in Kelly Fig. 6, and col. 7, lines 13-23. As discussed Fig. 6 of Kelly is the reserve table that relates absolute row numbers to screen row numbers. There is nothing in this cited section or in Kelly as to "determining an integer number of virtual pages", as recited in this element of claim 42. Furthermore, Kelly fails to teach or suggest "maintaining legibility, aspect ratio, and good margins" as recited in this element of claim 42.

Warnock is cited for teaching a "digital document". Warnock, however, provides no assistance in light of Kelly as to the recited methodology of claim 42. Accordingly, a combination of Kelly and Warnock fails to teach or suggest every element of claim 42, and the rejection of claim 42 is therefore improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 42 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 43-46 depend from and comprise all the elements of claim 42. As such, dependent claims 43-46 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 42. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 43-46 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 47 is rejected based on similar reasons as claims 11, 12, 18 and 19. Applicants assert the arguments presented in support of claims 1, 9 (claim 18 depending on claim 9) and 19, in support of claim 47. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 47 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 48-50 depend from and comprise all the elements of claim 47. As such, dependent claims 48-50 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 47. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 48-50 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 51 is rejected based on similar reasons as claim 17. Applicants assert the arguments presented in support of claims 1 and 9 (claim 17 depending on claim 9), in support of claim 51. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 51 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 52 is rejected based on similar reasons as claim 16. Applicants assert the arguments presented in support of claims 1 and 9 (claim 16 depending on claim 9), in support of claim 52. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 52 be withdrawn.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly in view of Warnock and U.S. Patent 6,188,779 to Baum (Baum). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly in view of Warnock and U.S. Patent 6,188,779 to Baum (Baum). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Dependent claim 5 depends from and comprises all the elements of claim 1. As such, dependent claim 5 is allowable at the least by virtue of its dependency on base claim 1.

Baum is cited for teaching "performing OCR on the content of a document to determine boundaries". Baum, however, provides no assistance in light of Kelly and Warnock as to the recited methodology of claim 5. Accordingly, a combination of Kelly, Warnock, and Baum fails to teach or suggest every element of claim 5, and the rejection of claim 5 is therefore improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

Claims 33-37 and 39-41 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly in view of Warnock and U.S. Patent 4,622,545 to Atkinson (Atkinson). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 33 recites in part "paginating one or more pages of the fixed digital document into multiple virtual pages". As discussed above in support of claim 1, Kelly fails to teach or suggest this element.

Claim 33 further recites "displaying one or more virtual pages of the multiple virtual pages and doing so with overlap on a virtual page, wherein the overlap of one virtual page includes content of the document repeated from another virtual page".

The Action presents that this element is taught in Kelly Fig. 4, and col. 6, lines 60-62. The cited section describes lines of text on the display screen, but does not show displaying "one or more virtual pages" as recited in this element of claim 33. Furthermore, the cited section states "the present invention does not require re-display of line 50 as the lines of text being view are correctly positioned on the screen". If the lines are not re-displayed as taught by Kelly, content is not repeated, and the teaching of Kelly is contrary to what is claimed in this element of claim 33. In particular, the element of claim 33 recites "wherein the overlap of one virtual page includes content of the document repeated from another virtual page".

Warnock is cited for teaching a "fixed digital document", and Atkinson is cited for teaching "overlap that is differentiated from other content". Warnock and Atkinson, however, provide no assistance in light of Kelly as to the recited methodology of claim 33. Accordingly, a combination of Kelly, Warnock, and Atkinson fails to teach or suggest every element of claim 33, and the rejection of claim 33 is therefore improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 33 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 34-37 and 39-41 depend from and comprise all the elements of claim 33. As such, dependent claims 34-37 and 39-41 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 33. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 4334-37 and 39-41 be withdrawn.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly, Warnock, Atkinson, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,909,217 to Bereiter (Bereiter). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Dependent claim 38 depends from and comprises all the elements of claim 33. As such, dependent claim 38 is allowable at the least by virtue of its dependency on base claim 33.

Bereiter is cited for teaching a "graying out portions of overlap". Bereiter, however, provides no assistance in light of Kelly, Warnock, and Atkinson as to the recited methodology of claim 33. Accordingly, a combination of Kelly, Warnock, Atkinson and Bereiter fails to teach or suggest every element of claim 38, and the rejection of claim 38 is therefore improper. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 38 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43 and 42-52 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 7/22/05

By: _____

Emmanuel Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256, ext. 245